

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 remain in this application. Claims 5-7 stand withdrawn from consideration as directed to a non-elected invention. Applicant respectfully requests entry of this amendment because it places the application in condition for allowance, or simplifies the issues on appeal.

Claims 1, 4 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Publication 2001/0003411 to *Honda et al.*, now U.S. Patent No. 6,713,961 (hereinafter “*Honda* ‘961). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Honda ‘961 discloses a light-emitting bulb provided with a light transmissive ceramic discharge enclosure. A metallic coil is wound on the outside surface of at least one of the small diameter portions having a first electrode inserted therethrough. The first electrode is coupled to have the same potential as a second electrode.

The present claimed invention, specifically claim 1, recites the elements of a high pressure discharge lamp and “...in a range from a 2nd reference plane to a 3rd reference plane, and a closed loop around one of the light emitting part and the first sealing part does not exist within the range... .” *Honda* ‘961 specifically shows a closed loop between the 2nd and 3rd surface planes.

Applicant encloses a reproduction of Figures 1, 4 and 6 of *Honda* ‘961. These drawings show, according to calculations based on the size of the embodiments described in *Honda* ‘961, one of the ends of the metallic coil that is furthest from the discharge space is located 4.4 meters away from the 1st reference plane, as marked on the attached Figures 1, 4 and 5 of *Honda* ‘961. According to *Honda* ‘961 a closed loop is formed at the end of this metallic coil. *Honda* ‘961

specifically teaches locating a closed loop “within the range from a second 2nd reference plane to a 3rd reference plane.”

This teaching is directly contrary to the express language of claim 1 “in a range from a 2nd reference plane to a 3rd reference plane, and a closed loop around one of the light emitting part and the first sealing part does not exist within the range.”

The present invention provides for a closed loop farther away from the discharge space than the 2nd reference plane. The closed loop will generate a magnetic field that will tend to cancel the high frequency magnetic field in the discharge space. By locating the closed loop far enough away from the discharge space, as claimed, the magnetic field generated by the closed loop does not have this deleterious impact on the discharge space and will not suppress the effect of the reduction in the breakdown voltage.

Honda ‘961, on the other hand, teaches the location of his closed loop closer to the discharge space than the 2nd reference plane. This loop will generate a magnetic field that will tend to cancel the high frequency magnetic field in the discharge space. Consequently, *Honda* ‘261 is not concerned with and does not have the benefit of a reduction in the breakdown voltage, as does the present invention.

Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 4 and 12 depend from and further limit the invention as set forth in claim 1. Applicant submits here the same arguments set forth above for the patentability of claim 1 and respectfully requests that the rejection as to claims 4 and 12 be withdrawn.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Honda* ‘961 and further in view of JP 58198327 to *Danno et al.* Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 3 depends from and further limits claim 1. Applicant submits here the arguments set forth above for the patentability of claim 1 and respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 3 be withdrawn.

Claims 8-11 and 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Honda '961* as applied to claim 1. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claims 8-11 and 13-14 depend from and further limit the invention as set forth in claim 1. Applicant submits here the arguments set forth above for the patentability of claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

In light of the above amendment and remarks, applicant respectfully submits that all of the elected claims are clearly patentable over the art of record and requests that they be allowed.

Applicant gives the Examiner the authority to cancel the non-elected claims 5-7 upon the allowance of claims 1, 3, 4 and 8-14.

The Examiner is respectfully invited to call applicant's attorney at the number listed if the prosecution of this application can be expedited by such a call.

Respectfully submitted,

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.



Albin H. Gess
Registration No. 25,726
600 Anton Boulevard, Suite 1400
Costa Mesa, California 92626
Telephone: (714) 427-7020
Facsimile: (714) 427-7799